

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 were previously pending. Claims 20-28 have been added, so Claims 1-28 are now pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13-17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandon (U.S. Patent 5,903,632) in view of Mirville et al. (U.S. Patent 5,745,553), and further in view of Tatchell et al. (U.S. Patent 6,160,877). Claims 5, 7, 12, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandon (U.S. Patent 5,903,632), Mirville et al. (U.S. Patent 5,745,553), Tatchell et al. (U.S. Patent 6,160,877), and further in view of Levine (U.S. Patent 6,076,121). In response to prior Office Actions, Applicants have explained why the proposed combinations previously cited by the Examiner were improper, and Applicants continue to believe that the new combinations proposed by the Examiner are improper for the same reasons as previously stated. However, for purposes of responding to the pending rejections, even assuming that the combinations are proper, the pending claims are patentable over the cited combinations for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended to recite: (i) storing a calling history for a calling party, where the calling history is generated using calling party identification information relating to the calling party; (ii) that calling party identification information relating to the calling party is received along with a dialed service code; and (iii) that a list of previously called parties is retrieved only upon receiving both the dialed service code and the calling party identification information. None of the references cited by the Examiner disclose these features.

While Brandon may disclose storing a log of outgoing telephone calls, it does not disclose storing a calling history for a calling party, where the calling history is generated using calling party identification information relating to the calling party, as recited in Claims 1, 8, and 14. To the contrary, Brandon discloses a standalone device that is incorporated into a telephone and that

appears to store only those telephone numbers dialed using the specific standalone device. Thus, Brandon does not disclose storing a calling history that is generated using calling party identification information. Likewise, Brandon does not disclose receiving calling party identification information and retrieving a list of previously called parties only upon receiving both a dialed service code and the calling party identification information, as recited in Claims 1, 8, and 14. Again, Brandon discloses a standalone device that is incorporated into a telephone and that appears to store only those telephone numbers dialed using the specific standalone device. These stored numbers are accessed by using a page browser or keypad and pointer keys. (Col. 6, lines 1-7). Thus, these numbers can be accessed without the use of a dialed service code or calling party identification information.

With respect to Mirville et al. and Tatchell et al., neither discloses storing a calling history for a calling party, so neither reference discloses storing a calling history that is generated using calling party identification information relating to the calling party. Likewise, neither Mirville et al. nor Tatchell et al. discloses retrieving a list of previously called parties only upon receiving both a dialed service code and calling party identification information. Accordingly, Claims 1, 8, and 14, as well as all dependent claims, are patentable over the proposed combination for at least these reasons.

With respect to Claim 7, it has been amended and now recites: (i) storing a calling history for a calling party, where the calling history is generated using calling party identification information relating to the calling party; (ii) that a personal identification number is received along with a vertical service code; and (iii) that a list of previously called parties is retrieved only upon receiving both the vertical service code and the personal identification number. None of the references cited by the Examiner disclose these features.

While Brandon may disclose storing a log of outgoing telephone calls, it does not disclose storing a calling history for a calling party, where the calling history is generated using calling party identification information relating to the calling party, as recited in Claim 7. To the contrary, as noted above, Brandon discloses a standalone device that is incorporated into a telephone and that appears to store only those telephone numbers dialed using the specific standalone device. Thus, Brandon does not disclose storing a calling history that is generated using calling party identification information. Likewise, Brandon does not disclose receiving a personal identification number and retrieving a list of previously called parties only upon receiving both a vertical service code and the personal identification number, as recited in Claim 7. Again, as noted above, Brandon discloses a standalone device that is incorporated into a telephone and that appears to store only those telephone numbers dialed using the specific standalone device. These stored numbers are accessed by using a page browser or keypad and pointer keys. (Col. 6, lines 1-7). Thus, these numbers can be accessed without the use of a vertical service code or a personal identification number.

With respect to Mirville et al., Tatchell et al., and Levine, none of these references disclose storing a calling history for a calling party, so none of these references disclose storing a calling history that is generated using calling party identification information relating to the calling party. Likewise, none of these references disclose retrieving a list of previously called parties only upon receiving both a vertical service code and a personal identification number. Accordingly, Claim 7 is patentable over the proposed combination for at least these reasons.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this case is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Jason C. White", is written over a horizontal line.

Jason C. White
Registration No. 42,223
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610